

## **SUMMARY MINUTES**

**BUILDING ADVISORY BOARD      TUESDAY – SEPTEMBER 11, 2007 – 4:00 P.M.  
ROOM 107, CITY-COUNTY BUILDING**

**Members Present:** Dallas Bruhl, Diana Dierks, Bob Haworth, Vernie Stillings, Steve Barnett, Rick Walters, Kenny Hancock (arrived 4:24), Donnie Marrs (arrived 4:57),

**Members Absent:** Mike Prester, Bob Dolan, Jim Manley

**Staff Present:** Mike Roberts, Sue Cline

*(Note: The agenda for this meeting was also sent to Class A, B contractors and local design professionals – total of 99 companies or individuals)*

**Audience Count:** 2

Meeting was called to order by Bob Haworth, Chairman, at 4:05 pm

### **(A) Approval of August 14, 2007 minutes**

**MOTION:** Vernie Stillings moved to approve the minutes as written

**SECOND:** Diana Dierks

**VOTE:** 6-0, motion carried

### **(B) Review of the proposed draft language to amend the 2005 NEC requirements for arc-fault protection**

Mike Roberts presented the staff report for this agenda item *(see staff report)*

The board members briefly discussed this agenda item. This item was on a previous agenda and had been discussed at length. It is reviewed today to bring new members up to date on this item.

Dallas Bruhl offered comments in support of the arc fault requirements and said that it is time to get on board with this.

**MOTION:** Dallas Bruhl moved to accept the draft language as presented in the staff report and recommend adoption of that language

**SECOND:** Steve Barnett

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 6-0 motion carried

### **(C) Review of new requirements in the 2005 NEC for concrete encased electrodes with comment by the Salina Homebuilders Association**

Mike Roberts presented the staff report for this agenda item (*see staff report*)

This agenda item was also discussed in a previous meeting, but was postponed to allow the Homebuilders Association time to present their perspectives.

Mike Flory, Homebuilders Association – presented comments in support of this requirement as long as Westar would accept the encased electrodes in lieu of the driven ground rod.

Mike Roberts reported that he did check with Westar they confirmed that they would accept this instead of the driven ground rod.

Bob Haworth reported that he recently tried this at a job site and it worked very well

Because the board is in support of the code requirements as written in the 2005 NEC, there is not a need for the board to take any formal action at this time. When the 2005 NEC is adopted that code requirement will then be in effect.

**(D) Review of the current 2006 International Building Code amendments**

Mike Roberts presented the staff report for this agenda item (*see staff report*)

(5:24 – Kenny Hancock arrived)

The board discussed this agenda item and reached a consensus indicating that they support the current code amendments as written with no recommendations for any changes with the next code cycle.

Mike Roberts explained that the main reason he wanted to present the current code amendments is because of the fact that Chapter 11 is amended out of the current codes and he wants to be sure that the board understands that they have the option to reconsider Chapter 11 with each code cycle review.

The board understood that recommending inclusion of Chapter 11 into the next code cycle would make the accessibility requirements more restrictive for private schools, churches and fraternal organizations.

Richard O'Farrell, O' Farrell Construction – offered comments indicating a concern that churches for example are used for more than just the church services. Outside organization use churches for other functions and he thought that perhaps they should be required to meet accessibility.

Mike Roberts explained further that the reason these types of organizations and buildings are not subject to the ADAAG requirements is because they are considered private versus public.

Mike Flory – offered comments indicating that he would not be supportive of including

Chapter 11 in the next code cycle, because it would be too costly for these types of organizations.

Bob Haworth – agreed and said that churches are not the same – some of them are very financially poor and shouldn't have more restrictions.

**MOTION:** Rick Walters moved to omit Chapter 11 from the 2006 code and make no changes to the currently adopted local code amendments and include those with the next code adoption.

**SECOND:** Diana Dierks

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 7-0 motion carried

**(E) Review of the proposed amendments to the 2006 International Building Code**

Mike Roberts presented the staff report for this agenda item (*see staff report*)

Each proposal included in this agenda item was discussed separately by the board.

Proposal #1 – Section 406.6.3 – Ventilation

Mike Roberts explained that this is basically an FYI at this time.

(*Donnie Marrs arrived at 4:57 pm*)

Proposal #2, Item #1 – Section 1003.5 Elevation change

Donnie Marrs – expressed concerns about this proposal, specifically the language in the last sentence of the first paragraph. He said that this is more restrictive than ADAAG and he would like this revision to be in line with ADAAG requirements.

Mike Roberts – asked Mr. Marrs if he thought the last sentence of the first paragraph should be deleted.

Mr. Marrs indicated that it should

Mike Roberts indicated that proposal #1 would basically be a less restrictive code.

**MOTION:** Don Marrs moved to recommend approval of Proposal #2, item #1 with the deletion of the last sentence of the first paragraph: *“where the difference in elevation is 6 inches, 152 mm, or less the ramp shall be equipped with either handrails or floor finish materials that contrast with adjacent floor finish materials”*

**SECOND:** Diana Dierks

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 8-0 motion carried

Proposal #2, Item #2, Section 1007.1, Accessible means of egress required.

Mike Roberts explained that most of the proposed changes to this amendment are necessary to clarify that ADAAG requirements apply and not the referenced code sections. Basically these changes are to clarify and stay in line with the fact that ADAAG requirements take precedent.

**MOTION:** Don Marrs moved to approve Proposal #2, Item #2 as presented in the staff report.

**SECOND:** Kenny Hancock

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 8-0 motion carried

Proposal #3: Item #1 Section 1008.1.4 Floor Elevation; Item #3 Section 1009.3 Stair Treads and risers; Item #4, Section 1009.10 Handrails; Item #5 Section 1012.5, Handrail extensions

Mike Roberts presented staff report

Don Marrs – expressed support for this amendment and commended staff for bringing the amendment proposal. He gave an example of a project that he designed which required a mezzanine mechanical room to meet the stair requirements that currently exist, even though it will be used very little by employees and not at all by the public.

**MOTION:** Don Marrs moved to approve Proposal #3, including items #1, #3, #4, #5 and not including item #2, which will be discussed separately.

**SECOND:** Rick Walters

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 8-0 motion carried

Proposal #3, Item #2, Section 1008.1.8.5 Unlatching

Mike Roberts presented staff report and explained the occupancy classifications that would be affected by this proposal

Dallas Bruhl expressed concerns about allowing this code amendment to apply to F-1 and F-2 uses

Mike Roberts clarified that the deadbolt locks that are keyed from the inside would not be allowed, only locks that can be unlocked by hand. Mr. Roberts also clarified that these types of locks are already permissible if they are not used in conjunction with any other type of latch. The proposal simply allows for two operations to unlatch a door instead of one.

Other board members offered examples of situations where factory workers might need to exit in an emergency situation. The board generally felt that they could do so safely with these types of locks in place on the doors.

**MOTION:** Vernie Stillings moved to approve Proposal #3, Item #2 as presented in the staff report.

**SECOND:** Diana Dierks

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 8-0 motion carried

Mike Roberts presented the remaining agenda item included in the staff report, which is a significant change to the 2006 IBC. Mike explained that in reviewing the new code he focuses on significant changes and brings those to the board.

The 2006 IBC will allow accessory buildings (conventional wood frame construction) up to 600 square feet to not be required to have frost proof footings.

The board discussed this change and agreed that they would not be supportive of this change and therefore would recommend a local code amendment to keep the maximum size at 400 square feet.

**MOTION:** Don Marrs moved to recommend a code amendment to the 2006 IBC which would keep the maximum size for accessory buildings without frost proof footings at 400 square feet.

**SECOND:** Dallas Bruhl

**DISCUSSION:** None

**VOTE:** 8-0 motion carried

**(F) Other Business -** None

**Bob Haworth** – adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.